

POST-INVESTIGATION REVIEW AND DEBRIEFING TOOL

Investigation Begin Date:

Investigation End Date:

Condition:

Investigation Participants:

Review Date:

Review Participants:

Can the progression of the investigation be easily traced through the documentation? If not, how could it be improved?

Does the documentation include a complete record of all persons who sought care or advice during the investigation (in person, via telephone, via email)?

Was communication among response team members adequate? If not, what was missing?

Was communication from management to staff regarding roles and responsibilities adequate? If not, what would have been helpful?

Was communication with clerical/support staff adequate? If not, what would have improved it?

Was communication from the department to local health care providers done well (including one-on-one and via provider advisories)? If not, what would have improved it?

Was communication from the health care community to the department done well? If not, what would have improved it?

Was communication with the public done well (including one-on-one, written info, and via the media)? If not, what would have improved it?

Was communication from the department to the State Department of Health and/or other state/federal agencies done well? If not, what would have improved it?

Were the protocols used? If not, why not?

Did the protocols “work” in this situation? Why or why not?

Were investigation tools and forms available? If yes, were they appropriate?

Was health officer availability adequate?

If investigation included role for environmental health, was their role clear to all team members? Did they fulfill their role?

Did Washington State Department of Health provide adequate assistance and consultation (if asked)? If not, what would have improved it? If they were not asked for assistance, should they have been?

Was an investigation overview/summary completed in a timely manner and shared with those appropriate? If not, how could this have been improved?

What worked particularly well in the investigation?

What did not work well?

List at least three suggestions to improve the quality of this response next time:

General Comments: